

S
u
Cont'd

Application Serial No. 09/057,502

Attorney's Docket No. 009683-329

Page 5

1 smoothing process so that smoothing dots are arranged around
2 edges of the image forming dots,
3 wherein said smoothing dots are smaller than the image
4 forming dots, and a distance between a center of at least one
5 of the smoothing dots and a center of one of the image forming
6 dots adjacent to said one smoothing dot is shorter than a
7 distance between the centers of adjacent image forming dots. --

REMARKS

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections of the present application.

Claim for Priority:

In response to the suggestion by the Examiner, a certified copy of the priority application is submitted concurrently herewith. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of the priority application.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,745,131, hereinafter Kneezel, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,146,236, hereinafter Hirata. In addition, claims 5-8, 13-16, and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the art applied against the

aforementioned claims, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,980,015.

According to claim 1, an ink jet printer according to the present invention includes a controller for controlling a smoother to print a center of a smaller size dot closer to a center of an image forming dot at a distance smaller than the pitch of the image forming dots. According to claim 9, an ink jet printer according to the present invention includes a controller for changing a distance between the centers of adjacent dots to change the printing position of the dot based on the size of the dot. And, the method of claim 17 includes controlling the timing of printing a dot under certain conditions.

However, the rejection of all of the independent claims is based on an incorrect understanding of the Hirata reference.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Hirata discloses in Figures 11B, 11C and 12, an ink jet printer in which smaller dots are printed with a smaller pitch than larger dots. However, a careful reading of the Hirata disclosure reveals that all of the dots in Hirata are printed at the same pitch. The reason that the dots illustrated in Figure 11C are closer to each other than the dots in Figure 11B is explained at column 8, lines 37-50. The dots illustrated in Figure 11B show an example of dots printed at a predetermined pitch which

results in 300 dpi. With regard to Figure 11C, the dots are printed at the same pitch as the dots in 11B. However, the ink dots indicated by hatching lines in Figure 11C are printed in a first scan. Then, the recording paper is fed by a length equal to half a dot pitch. Then, a second scan is made on the same scan line to produce the second set of ink dots in Figure 11C, i.e., those without hatching. The result is that the dots are twice as close to each other as those in Figure 11B. However, in both examples, the dots are printed at the same pitch. Furthermore, Hirata does not teach printing the smaller dots of Fig. 11C in the same image as the larger dots of Fig. 11B. Accordingly, Hirata does not disclose, as alleged by the Examiner, that the smaller dots are printed with a smaller pitch than larger dots. And, Hirata does not teach that a small dot is printed adjacent to a large dot.

Accordingly, in view of the fact that Hirata does not disclose a printing apparatus as set forth in the Official Action, the rejections of all of the pending claims are based on an erroneous understanding of the Hirata reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

The new claims 24-30 are also patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1-23.

Application Serial No. 09/057,502

Attorney's Docket No. 009683-329

Page 8

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: December 4, 2000